



#20  
MDS  
4.22.03

Applicant(s)	John S. Lee	AMENDMENT & RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.111
Serial No.	09/501,434	
Filing Date	February 10, 2000	
Group Art Unit	2653	
Examiner Name	Kim Kwok Chu	
Confirmation No.	3838	
Attorney Docket No.	510.030US01	
Title: MEDIUM HANDLER AND ORGANIZER		RECEIVED APR 21 2003

Technology Center 2600

Commissioner for Patents  
Box Non-Fee Amendment  
Washington, D.C. 20231

In response to the non-final Office Action mailed January 16, 2003, please consider the following remarks.

#### REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claim 28 and for the indication that claims 2, 5-8, 10-12, 29, and 31 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 1-2, 4-19, and 21-31 remain for consideration in this case.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Balsom (U. S. Patent No. 5,592,596) in view of Hayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,525). Applicant strongly traverses the rejection, and submits that the cited references do not allow for a proper *prima facie* case to be made under 35 U.S.C. § 103. MPEP 2142, in pertinent part, sets forth the requirements for a *prima facie* case of obviousness:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must